The primitive element theorem for differential fields with zero derivation on the ground field

Gleb A. Pogudin[a]

[a]*Department of Higher Algebra, Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics, Moscow State University, Leninskie Gory 1, GSP-1, Moscow, 119991, Russia*

arXiv:1409.3847v2 [math.RA] 14 Oct 2014

Abstract

In this paper we strengthen Kolchin's theorem ([1]) in the ordinary case. It states that if a differential field E is finitely generated over a differential subfield $F \subset E$, $\operatorname{trdeg}_F E < \infty$, and F contains a nonconstant, i.e. an element f such that $f' \neq 0$, then there exists $a \in E$ such that E is generated by a and F. We replace the last condition with the existence of a nonconstant element in E.

Keywords: differential field, primitive element, derivation

2000 MSC: 12H05, 13N15

Introduction

All fields considered in this paper are of characteristic zero.

Let R be a ring. A map $D\colon R \to R$ satisfying $D(a+b) = D(a) + D(b)$ and $D(ab) = aD(b) + D(a)b$ for all $a, b \in R$ is called *derivation*. We will denote $D(x)$ by x' and $D^n(x)$ by $x^{(n)}$.

A *differential ring* R is a ring with a specified derivation. A differential ring which is a field will be called a *differential field*. Let $F \subset E$ be a differential field extension and $a \in E$. Let us denote by $F\langle a\rangle$ the differential subfield of E generated by F and a. If $F\langle a\rangle = E$, then element a is said to be *primitive*.

An element $a \in R$ of the differential ring R is said to be *constant* if $a' = 0$.

Kolchin proved ([1]) a differential analogue of the primitive element theorem:

Theorem. *Let $E = F\langle a_1, \ldots, a_n\rangle$ and $\operatorname{trdeg}_F E < \infty$. Assume also that F contains a nonconstant element. Then, there exists $b \in E$ such that $E = F\langle b\rangle$.*

Corollary. *Let $E = F\langle a_1, \ldots, a_n\rangle$ and $\operatorname{trdeg}_F E < \infty$. Assume also that E contains a nonconstant element. Then, there exist $b, c \in E$ such that $E = F\langle b, c\rangle$.*

Remark 1. In [1] Kolchin considered a more general case, i.e. fields equipped with a set of commuting derivations. We restrict ourselves to the ordinary case.

In [2] Babakhanian constructed primitive elements for several specific extensions $F \subset E$ with F consisting of constant elements.

The goal of the present paper is to prove the primitive element theorem for the case $f' = 0$ for all $f \in F$.

Main results

Theorem 1. *Let $E = k\langle a, b\rangle$, $\operatorname{trdeg}_k E < \infty$, and $b' \neq 0$. Then, there exists $p(x) \in k[x]$ such that $\operatorname{trdeg}_k k\langle a + p(b)\rangle = \operatorname{trdeg}_k k\langle a, b\rangle$.*

Email address: pogudin.gleb@gmail.com (Gleb A. Pogudin)

Theorem 2. *Let $E = k\langle a_1, \ldots, a_m\rangle$, $\operatorname{trdeg}_k E < \infty$, and E contains a nonconstant. Then, there exists $a \in E$ such that $E = k\langle a\rangle$.*

Remark 2. Unlike Kolchin's proof it is not sufficient to consider elements of the form $a + \lambda b$ ($\lambda \in k$). For example, let $\mathbb{Q}(x, y)$ be a differential field with the derivation defined by $x' = 1$ and $y' = 0$. There is no primitive element of the form $y + \lambda x$ ($\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$), but $\mathbb{Q}(x, y) = \mathbb{Q}\langle x^2 + y\rangle$.

Proof of Theorem 1. We will need the following well-known lemmas:

Lemma 1. *If $\operatorname{trdeg}_k k\langle a\rangle = n$, then $k\langle a\rangle = k\left(a, a', \ldots, a^{(n)}\right)$.*

Proof. Let m be the minimal integer such that $a, \ldots, a^{(m)}$ are algebraically dependent over k. Let $R(a, \ldots, a^{(m)}) = 0$ be the corresponding algebraic relation. Hence

$$0 = \left(R(a, \ldots, a^{(m)})\right)' = \sum_{i=0}^{m} a^{(i+1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial a^{(i)}} R$$

, so $a^{(m+1)} \in k(a, \ldots, a^{(m)})$.

Similarly we obtain that $a^{(N)} \in k(a, \ldots, a^{(m)})$ for all N. Hence, $n = m$ and $k\langle a\rangle = k\left(a, \ldots, a^{(n)}\right)$. □

Lemma 2 ([3], p.35)**.** *Let $q(x, x', \ldots, x^{(n)})$ be a nonzero differential polynomial over a differential field E. Let $f \in E$ be a noncostant element. Then, there exists $p(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ such that*

$$q(x, x', \ldots, x^{(n)})\Big|_{x=p(f)} \neq 0$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $E = k\langle a, b\rangle$. Let us introduce algebraically independent variables $\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, \ldots$. We extend the derivation from E to $E[\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, \ldots]$ by $(\Lambda_i)' = b'\Lambda_{i+1}$. This construction can be explained by the following observation: let us fix a polynomial $p(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$; the formulas $\varphi_p(\Lambda_i) = p^{(i)}(b)$ define a homomorphism of differential k-algebras $\varphi_p \colon E[\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, \ldots] \to E$.

Let $c = a + \Lambda_0$ and $K = k(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, \ldots) \subset E(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, \ldots)$. Since $K\langle c\rangle \subset K\langle a, b\rangle$, $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\langle c\rangle = n < \infty$. Let nonzero $R(x_0, \ldots, x_n) \in K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ satisfy $R(c, c', \ldots, c^{(n)}) = 0$. Notice that it depends on x_n. Multiplying by the suitable element of $k[\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, \ldots]$, we obtain a polynomial in both $c, c', \ldots, c^{(n)}$ and $\Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_N$ over k. Let us denote it by $Q(c, \ldots, c^{(n)}, \Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_N)$. Moreover, we assume that Q satisfies the following conditions:

1. $\deg_{c^{(n)}} Q$ is a minimal possible;
2. under the above condition, N is a minimal possible;
3. under the above conditions, $\deg_{\Lambda_N} Q$ is minimal possible.

Lemma 3. *$N = n$.*

Proof. Assume that $N > n$. Let us rewrite Q as a polynomial in Λ_N: $Q = q_m\Lambda_N^m + \ldots + q_0$, where q_i are polynomials over k in $c, \ldots, c^{(n)}, \Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_{N-1}$. Since $N > n$, $c, \ldots, c^{(n)} \in E(\Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_{N-1})$ and Λ_N is transcendental over $k(c, \ldots, c^{(n)}, \Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_{N-1})$. Thus, $Q = 0$ implies $q_i = 0$ for all i. We obtained a contradiction with minimality of N.

Assume that $N < n$. Clearly, $c^{(n)} = (b')^n\Lambda_n + c_0$, where $c_0 \in E(\Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_{n-1})$. Thus, $c^{(n)}$ is transcendental over $k(c, \ldots, c^{(n-1)}, \Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_N) \subset E(\Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_{n-1})$. But Q depends on $c^{(n)}$. This contradiction proves the lemma. □

Lemma 4. *$\frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_n} Q \neq 0$.*

Proof. It follows immediately from the minimality conditions for Q and inequalities $\deg_{c^{(n)}} Q \geqslant \deg_{c^{(n)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_n} Q$ and $\deg_{\Lambda_n} Q > \deg_{\Lambda_n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_n} Q > -\infty$. □

We return to the proof of Theorem 1.

Let $p(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$. Applying φ_p to $Q(c, \ldots, c^{(n)}, \Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_n)$, we obtain an algebraic dependence for $\varphi_p(\Lambda_0), \ldots, \varphi_p(\Lambda_n) \in \mathbb{Q}[b]$ over $k\left(\varphi_p(c), \ldots, \varphi_p(c^{(n)})\right)$. It yields to an algebraic dependence for b over $k\left(\varphi_p(c), \ldots, \varphi_p(c^{(n)})\right)$. The goal is to find an appropriate $p(x)$ to make this dependence nontrivial. Let us compute its derivation with respect to b:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial b} Q\left(\varphi_p(c), \ldots, \varphi_p(c^{(n)}), p(b), \ldots, p^{(n)}(b)\right) = \\ = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \varphi_p\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_i} Q\right) p^{(i+1)}(b) = \varphi_p\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n} \Lambda_{i+1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_i} Q\right) \quad (1)$$

By Lemma 4 the polynomial $T = \sum\limits_{i=0}^{n} \Lambda_{i+1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_i} Q$ is nonzero. Since $c = a + \Lambda_0$, we can rewrite T as a nonzero polynomial in $\Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_{n+1}$ over $k\langle a, b\rangle$. Let us denote the derivation on E by D. Then, $\tilde{D} = \frac{1}{b'} D$ is also a derivation on E. Obviously, $\tilde{D}\Lambda_i = \Lambda_{i+1}$.

Hence, we can apply Lemma 2 to the differential field E with respect to $\tilde{D}$, nonconstant element $b \in E$, and the polynomial T in variables $\Lambda_0, \ldots, \Lambda_n$. Therefore, we obtain such $p(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ that $\varphi_p(T) \neq 0$.

Since $\varphi_p(c) = a + p(b)$ and b are both algebraic over $k\langle\varphi_p(c)\rangle$, a is also algebraic over $k\langle\varphi_p(c)\rangle$. Hence, $\operatorname{trdeg}_k k\langle\varphi_p(c)\rangle = \operatorname{trdeg} k\langle a, b\rangle$.

□

The following corollary can be derived using exactly the same argument as above.

Corollary 1. *Let $E = k\langle a, b\rangle$, $\operatorname{trdeg}_k E < \infty$, $b' \neq 0$ and $c \in k\langle a, b\rangle$. Then, there exists $p(x) \in k[x]$ such that $\operatorname{trdeg} k\langle a + c \cdot p(b)\rangle = \operatorname{trdeg} k\langle a, b\rangle$.*

Proof of Theorem 2. Due to Theorem 1 there exists $a \in E$ such that $\operatorname{trdeg}_k E = \operatorname{trdeg}_k k\langle a\rangle = n$. Since $\dim_{k\langle a\rangle} E < \infty$ there exists $b \in E$ such that $E = k\langle a, b\rangle$. We are going to find $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{n+2} \in k$ such that $E = k\langle b + \lambda_1 a + \lambda_2 a^2 + \ldots + \lambda_{n+2} a^{n+2}\rangle$.

We will use the method used by Kolchin in [1, p.729]. Let us recall necessary definitions.

Let K_1 be a differential extension field of L. By an *isomorphism of K_1 with respect to L* we will mean an isomorphic mapping of K_1 onto a differential field K_2 such that

1. K_2 is an extension of L;
2. the isomorphic mapping leaves each element of L invariant;

Lemma 5 (Kolchin, ([1], p.726))**.** *Let E be an extension of F and $\gamma \in E$. A necessary and sufficent condition for $E = F\langle\gamma\rangle$ is that no isomorphism of E with respect to F other then the identity leaves γ invariant.*

Let $R(x, x', \ldots, x^{(n)}) \in k\{x\}$ (shortly, $R(x)$) have a solution $x = a$ and $Q(x, x', \ldots, x^{(n-1)}, y) \in k\{x, y\}$ (shortly, $Q(x, y)$) have a solution $x = a$, $y = b$. We will show that there exist elements $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ such that $z = y + \lambda_1 x + \ldots + \lambda_n x^n$ takes different values for different solutions of $\{R(x), Q(x, y)\}$. Then, certainly z will satisfy the requirements on γ from Lemma 5.

To prove this statement, let $t_1, \ldots, t_{n+2}$ be new indeterminates, and, in $E\{x, y, t_1, \ldots, t_{n+2}\}$, consider the perfect differential ideal (for definitions see [3, p.2, p.7])

$$I = \{R(x), Q(x, y), t_1', \ldots, t_{n+2}', b - y + t_1(a - x) + t_2(a^2 - x^2) + \ldots + t_{n+2}(a^{n+2} - x^{n+2})\}$$

Let $I = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \ldots \cap \mathfrak{p}_s$ be the decomposition of I into essential prime differential ideals (see [3, p.13]), and suppose the subscripts have been assigned so that each $\mathfrak{p}_1$, …, $\mathfrak{p}_r$ contains both $a - x$ and $b - y$, whereas $\mathfrak{p}_{r+1}$, …, $\mathfrak{p}_s$ each

fails to contain either $a-x$ or $b-y$. Consider $\mathfrak{p}_j$ with $j>r$. If $b-y\notin\mathfrak{p}_j$, then also $a-x\notin\mathfrak{p}_j$. Thus, $a-x\notin\mathfrak{p}_j$ for all $j>r$. Let $\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{t}_1,\ldots,\overline{t}_n$ be a generic solution of $\mathfrak{p}_j$ (see [1, p.725]). Differentiating the equation

$$b-\overline{y}+\overline{t}_1(a-\overline{x})+\overline{t}_2(a^2-\overline{x}^2)+\ldots+\overline{t}_n(a^n-\overline{x}^n)=0$$

$n+1$ times, we obtain a system of linear equations in $\overline{t}_1,\ldots,\overline{t}_{n+2}$. Let us investigate it.

Let us denote by $\mathrm{wr}(f_1,\ldots,f_N)$ the wronskian of f_1, ..., f_N (see [4, chap. 2]).

Let $W_{k,l}(x,y)$ be given by $\mathrm{wr}(x-y,\ldots,\widehat{x^l-y^l},\ldots,x^{k+1}-y^{k+1})$ where $k\geqslant 2$ and $1\leqslant l\leqslant k+1$.

Lemma 6. *If $W_{k,l}(a,\overline{x})=0$ for all $1\leqslant l\leqslant k+1$, then $\mathrm{trdeg}_k\, k\langle a,\overline{x}\rangle\leqslant n+k-2$.*

Proof. Let x and y be differential indeterminates. First of all, we are going to establish several properties of differential polynomials $W_{k,l}(x,y)$.

Lemma 7. *$W_{k,l}(x,y)=A_l(x,y)+x^{(k-1)}B_l(x,y)+y^{(k-1)}C_l(x,y)$ where $A_l,B_l,C_l\in\mathbb{Q}[x,\ldots,x^{(k-2)},y,\ldots,y^{(k-2)}]$. Moreover, if $k\geqslant 3$, then $B_l(x,y)=-y'D_l(x,y)$ and $C_l(x,y)=x'D_l(x,y)$ where $D_l\in\mathbb{Q}[x,\ldots,x^{(k-2)},y,\ldots,y^{(k-2)}]$.*

Proof. For the sake of simplicity let us consider $l=k+1$. The proof for the other cases is analogous. The last row of the corresponding matrix is a sum of three rows: $x^{(k-1)}(1,2x,\ldots,kx^{k-1})$, $-y^{(k-1)}(1,2y,\ldots,y^{k-1})$ and $(a_1,\ldots,a_k)$ where $a_i\in\mathbb{Q}[x,\ldots,x^{(k-2)},y,\ldots,y^{(k-2)}]$ for all i. Thus, the determinant $W_{k,k+1}(x,y)$ can be expressed as a sum:

$$\begin{vmatrix} x-y & \ldots & x^k-y^k \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x-y)^{(k-2)} & \ldots & \left(x^k-y^k\right)^{(k-2)} \\ a_1 & \ldots & a_k \end{vmatrix} + x^{(k-1)} \begin{vmatrix} x-y & \ldots & x^k-y^k \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x-y)^{(k-2)} & \ldots & \left(x^k-y^k\right)^{(k-2)} \\ 1 & \ldots & kx^{k-1} \end{vmatrix} - y^{(k-1)} \begin{vmatrix} x-y & \ldots & x^k-y^k \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x-y)^{(k-2)} & \ldots & \left(x^k-y^k\right)^{(k-2)} \\ 1 & \ldots & ky^{k-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

The above equality proves the first statement of the lemma.

Now let $k\geqslant 3$. The second row of the corresponding matrix is a sum of $x'(1,2x,\ldots,kx^{k-1})$ and $-y'(1,2y,\ldots,ky^{k-1})$. Hence, substracting the last row from the second, we obtain:

$$B_l=\begin{vmatrix} x-y & \ldots & x^k-y^k \\ x'-y' & \ldots & x'kx^{k-1}-y'ky^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \ldots & kx^{k-1} \end{vmatrix} = -y' \begin{vmatrix} x-y & \ldots & x^k-y^k \\ 1 & \ldots & ky^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \ldots & kx^{k-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

Let us denote the latter determinant by D_l. Then, $B_l=-y'D_l$. Likewise, $C_l=x'D_l$, so we are done. □

Lemma 8. *At least one of $\frac{W_{k,1}(x,y)}{W_{k,k+1}(x,y)}$, ..., $\frac{W_{k,k}(x,y)}{W_{k,k+1}(x,y)}$ depends on $x^{(k-1)}$ and $y^{(k-1)}$.*

Proof. Since all these differential polynomials are symmetric in x and y, it suffices to prove that at least one of them depends on either $x^{(k-1)}$ or $y^{(k-1)}$. Assume the contrary, that $(-1)^{k-l}\frac{W_{k,l}(x,y)}{W_{k,k+1}(x,y)}\in\mathbb{Q}(x,\ldots,x^{(k-2)},y,\ldots,y^{(k-2)})$. By the Cramer's rule these fractions are solutions of the following system of linear equations in $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_k$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x-y & \ldots & x^k-y^k \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x-y)^{(k-1)} & \ldots & \left(x^k-y^k\right)^{(k-1)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x^{k+1}-y^{k+1} \\ \vdots \\ \left(x^{k+1}-y^{k+1}\right)^{(k-1)} \end{pmatrix} \qquad (*)$$

Since $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_k\in\mathbb{Q}(x,\ldots,x^{(k-2)},y,\ldots,y^{(k-2)})$ and both $x^{(k-1)}$ and $y^{(k-1)}$ are transcendental over this field, the last equation also implies two following equalities:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1+2x\alpha_2+\ldots+kx^{k-1}\alpha_k=(k+1)x^k \\ \alpha_1+2y\alpha_2+\ldots+ky^{k-1}\alpha_k=(k+1)y^k \end{cases} \qquad (**)$$

We are going to assign values from a particular differential field to x and y. Precisely, let $\mathbb{C}(t)$ be a field of rational functions equipped with standard derivation ($t' = 1$) and ξ be a primitive $(k+1)$-th root of unity. Let $x = t$ and $y = \xi t$. The matrix of the system (*) is nondegenerate, because its determinant equals $\operatorname{wr}\big((1-\xi)t, \ldots, (1-\xi^k)t^k\big)$, which is nonzero since $(1-\xi)t$, ..., $(1-\xi^k)t^k$ are linearly independent over constants ([4, prop. 2.8]). Clearly, the unique solution of the system (*) in this case is $\alpha_1 = \ldots = \alpha_k = 0$. But the equalities (**) do not hold. This contradiction proves the lemma. □

Corollary 2. *If $k \geqslant 3$ then there exists $1 \leqslant l \leqslant k$ such that $W_{k,l}(x,y)D_{k+1}(x,y) - W_{k,k+1}(x,y)D_l(x,y) = A_l(x,y)D_{k+1}(x,y) - A_{k+1}(x,y)D_l(x,y) \neq 0$.*

Proof. By the Lemma 8 there exists $1 \leqslant l \leqslant k$ such that $\frac{W_{k,l}(x,y)}{W_{k,k+1}(x,y)}$ depends on $x^{(k-1)}$ and $y^{(k-1)}$. This means that vectors (A_l, B_l, C_l) and $(A_{k+1}, B_{k+1}, C_{k+1})$ are not proportional. Thus, $D_{k+1}(A_l, B_l, C_l) - D_l(A_{k+1}, B_{k+1}, C_{k+1}) = (A_l D_{k+1} - A_{k+1}D_l, 0, 0) \neq 0$. □

We return to the proof of Lemma 6.

Let us consider two cases:

1. $k \leqslant 3$. Let l be the index from the corollary 2. Since $W_{k,l}(a, \overline{x}) = W_{k,k+1}(a, \overline{x}) = 0$, $W_{k,l}(a,\overline{x})D_{k+1}(a,\overline{x}) - W_{k,k+1}(a,\overline{x})D_l(a,\overline{x})$ provides us an algebraic relation between a, ..., $a^{(k-2)}$, $\overline{x}$, ..., $\overline{x}^{(k-2)}$. Hence, $\overline{x}^{(j)}$ is algebraic over $k(a, \ldots, a^{(n-1)}, \overline{x}, \ldots, \overline{x}^{(k-3)})$ for all j. Thus, $k\langle a, \overline{x}\rangle$ is algebraic over $k(a, \ldots, a^{(n-1)}, \overline{x}, \ldots, \overline{x}^{(k-3)})$. Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_k k(a, \ldots, a^{(n-1)}, \overline{x}, \ldots, \overline{x}^{(k-3)}) \leqslant n + k - 2$, we are done.
2. $k = 2$. In this case both $W_{2,2}(x,y)$ and $W_{2,3}(x,y)$ can be computed directly:

$$W_{2,3}(x,y) = (x-y)^2(x'+y')$$

$$W_{2,2}(x,y) = (x-y)(x'(2x^2 - xy - y^2) + y'(x^2 + xy - 2y^2))$$

If both $W_{2,3}(a,\overline{x})$ and $W_{2,2}(a,\overline{x})$ vanish, either $a' = \overline{x}' = 0$ or the determinant of the system of linear equations $W_{2,3}(a,\overline{x}) = W_{2,2}(a,\overline{x}) = 0$ in variables a' and $\overline{x}'$ vanishes, i.e. $-(a-\overline{x})^5 = 0$. Both cases are impossible since $a \neq \overline{x}$.

□

Lemma 9. $\operatorname{trdeg}_k k\langle a, b, \overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{t}_1, \ldots, \overline{t}_{n+2}\rangle \leqslant 2n+1$.

Proof. Differentiating the equation $\overline{y} - b = \overline{t}_1(a - \overline{x}) + \ldots + \overline{t}_{n+2}(a^{n+2} - \overline{x}^{n+2})$, we obtain the following matrix equality:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{y} - b \\ \overline{y}' - b' \\ \vdots \\ \overline{y}^{(n+1)} - b^{(n+1)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a - \overline{x} & \ldots & a^{n+2} - \overline{x}^{n+2} \\ a' - \overline{x}' & \ldots & \big(a^{n+2} - \overline{x}^{n+2}\big)' \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a^{(n+1)} - \overline{x}^{(n+1)} & \ldots & \big(a^{n+2} - \overline{x}^{n+2}\big)^{(n+1)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{t}_1 \\ \overline{t}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \overline{t}_{n+2} \end{pmatrix}$$

Let k be a minimal number such that for all $1 \leqslant l \leqslant k+1$ the equality $W_{k,l}(a,\overline{x}) = 0$ holds. Let us consider two cases:

1. $k < n + 2$. Thus, at least one of $(k-1) \times (k-1)$ minors of the matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a - \overline{x} & \ldots & a^{n+2} - \overline{x}^{n+2} \\ \ldots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a^{(k-2)} - \overline{x}^{(k-2)} & \ldots & \big(a^{n+2} - \overline{x}^{n+2}\big)^{(k-2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

is nondegenerate. Let $W_{k-1,l}(a,\overline{x}) \neq 0$. Multiplying by the inverse matrix, we obtain the formulas which express $\overline{t}_j$ as a rational function in a, b, $\overline{x}$, $\overline{y}$ and their derivations, $\overline{t}_l$, $\overline{t}_{k+1},\ldots,\overline{t}_{n+2}$ for all $1 \leqslant j \leqslant k$ and $j \neq l$.

Hence, $\overline{t}_1,\ldots,\overline{t}_{l-1},\overline{t}_{l+1},\ldots,\overline{t}_k \in k\langle a,b,\overline{x},\overline{y}\rangle(\overline{t}_l,\overline{t}_{k+1},\ldots,\overline{t}_{n+2})$. By Lemma 6, $\mathrm{trdeg}_k\, k\langle a,b,\overline{x},\overline{y}\rangle \leqslant n+k-2$. Thus

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_k\, k\langle a,b,\overline{x},\overline{y},\overline{t}_1,\ldots,\overline{t}_{n+2}\rangle \leqslant \mathrm{trdeg}_k\, k\langle a,b,\overline{x},\overline{y}\rangle + n - k + 3 \leqslant (n+k-2)+(n-k+3) = 2n+1$$

2. $k \geqslant n+2$. In this case $\mathrm{trdeg}_k\, k\langle a,b,\overline{x},\overline{y}\rangle \leqslant 2n$. There exists $1 \leqslant l \leqslant n+2$ such that $W_{n+1,l}(a,\overline{x}) \neq 0$. By the same argument as above $\overline{t}_1,\ldots,\overline{t}_{l-1},\overline{t}_{l+1},\ldots,\overline{t}_{n+2} \in k\langle a,b,\overline{x},\overline{y}\rangle(\overline{t}_l)$. The desired inequality is now obvious.

□

Lemma 9 implies that $\overline{t}_1$, …, $\overline{t}_{n+2}$ are algebraically dependent over $k\langle a,b\rangle$. Let us denote this dependence by $P_j(t_1,\ldots,t_{n+2}) \in E[t_1,\ldots t_{n+2}]$. Consider the polynomial $P = P_{r+1}\cdot\ldots\cdot P_s$. Let $\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{n+2} \in k$ satisfy $P(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{n+2}) \neq 0$. Then, $b - y + \lambda_1(a-x) + \ldots + \lambda_{n+2}(a^{n+2} - a^{n+2}) \neq 0$ for any solution of $\{R(x),Q(x,y)\}$ other than (b,a). Therefore, the proof of the theorem is complete.

□

The author is grateful to Dmitry Trushin and Yu.P. Razmyslow for useful discussions.

[1] Kolchin E.R., *Extensions of differential fields, I*, Annals of Mathematics, vol. 43, 1942.

[2] Babakhanian A., *On primitive elements in differentially algebraic extension fields*, Trans. AMS, vol. 143, 71-83, 1968.

[3] Ritt J.F., *Differential algebra*, Colloquium publications of AMS, vol. 33, 1948.

[4] Magid A. R., *Lectures on differential Galois theory*, University lecture series of AMS, vol. 7, 1994.